DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 516 EA 021 237

AUTHOR Kimpston, Richard D.; Rogers, Karen B.
TITLE The Influence of Prior Perspectives, Roles, and Participation upon Views about Curriculum Development.
PUB DATE Apr 86
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 16-20, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Community Involvement; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Problems; Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Development; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

An examination is conducted of a 2-year case study of teacher, principal, and community involvement in curriculum planning in a school district. In particular, participants' expectations, satisfaction, and attitudes toward curriculum planning and the relationship of these variables to the resulting process and product are discussed. Relevant literature is also reviewed. The study was carried out in one large midwest suburban district consisting of 5,000 students and 750 teachers. Although teachers and administrators differed significantly in their attitudes towrd the district curriculum, no significant difference was found between the two groups in their perception of the curriculum documentation product. Differences between expected participatory roles and reported satisfaction with these roles after participation were found to depend upon the actual roles participants assumed and the extent to which they were involved in the process. (36 references) (SI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED310516

The Influence of Prior Perspectives, Roles, and Participation Upon Views About Curriculum Development

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Richard D. Kimpston
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Richard D. Kimpston
Associate Professor
Curriculum Systems
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota

Karen B. Rogers
Instructor
Graduate Studies in Education and Community Services
College of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota

To be presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA, April, 1986

EA021237

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

THE INFLUENCE OF PRIOR PERSPECTIVES, ROLES, AND PARTICIPATION UPON VIEWS ABOUT CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

At present there is a strong and growing expectation in the United States that schools will employ systematic procedures in curriculum planning decisions, with a broad base of professional involvement. This expectation can be noted with even the most cursory review of educational literature, job descriptions for curriculum leaders, state directives to school districts, and current state legislation.

In this atmosphere of participative and systematic decision-making, it is imperative that we consider the participants, their views about curriculum planning, and the relationship of these views to the planning process. This paper will describe a two-year case study that focused on teacher, principal, and community involvement in curriculum planning in a school district. The study, in particular, focused on the participants' expectations, satisfactions, and attitudes toward curriculum planning and the relationship of these variables to the resulting process and product.

In this paper relevant literature is first reviewed. This literature focuses on teacher, principal, and community involvement in curriculum planning. The study design, instruments used in conducting the study, the analysis of the data, the results, and discussion of the results conclude this paper.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The research review reported in this paper helped bring into sharper focus the relationship of teachers, principals, and community members in curriculum planning and its impact on the resulting process and product. The

participation of each of the three groups in curriculum decision-making is reviewed in turn.

From the 1960s to the present, teachers' associations have pressed for greater teacher participation in decision-making. As Carson and Friesen (1978) expressed it, "It is generally felt that since teachers possess professional knowledge, they should be involved to a considerable extent in educational decision-making in order to practice their expertise as well as to protect their professional interests" (p. 2). Many researchers have concluded that participation in decision-making results in greater job satisfaction, higher productivity, lower costs, and greater commitment to and personal integration into an organization (for example, Allutto & Belasco, 1972; Myers, 1970; Likert, 1967; Garms, Guthrie & Pierce, 1978; Johnson & Johnson, 1975).

Because participation in decision-making was thought to be desirable for both the teachers and the school district, the notion grew that teachers desired such involvement. Allutto and Belasco (1972) concluded, however, that reduction in shared decision-making responsibilities provided the greatest personal and organizational benefits for decisionally saturated teachers. Subsequent research (Ponder & Bulcock, 1976; Hoy & Miskel, 1978; Mohrman, Cooke & Mohrman, 1978) revealed that teachers' desires for participation in decision-making depended on the kinds of decisions, the amount of expertise they believe they bring to the process, and the degree to which they are required to participate. Teachers have voiced very definite preferences for particular types of curriculum work, including: (1) the translation of curriculum into instruction (Young, 1979), and (2) the development of activities directly related to their individual classrooms (Lortie, 1975). When participation in curriculum planning goes beyond the classroom level, much skepticism about personal benefits as well as the success of their efforts has resulted (Duke, Showers, & Imbel, 1980). However, time and time

again researchers have argued that teachers' perceptions of active participation in curriculum development and actual involvement of teachers in the development process significantly affect the successful implementation of the curriculum (Young, 1979; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977).

Though principals express interest in curriculum planning, research suggests that they are not necessarily curriculum and instructional leaders. Fullan (1981) indicates that ". . . typically the principals view themselves as catalysts, facilitators, reviewers, and resource providers" (p. 22). Eastabrook and Fullan (1978) found that 76% of principals in one study sample wanted to be involved in curriculum process and demonstrated real concern regarding process and outcomes. Conversely, Berman and McLaughlin (1977) found that approximately one-third of teachers believe principals act primarily as administrators and are only minimally effective in curriculum change. Hord and Austin (1984) also concluded that principals are primarily administrators who work with materials, equipment, hiring and scheduling. Lippitt (1967), however, concluded that the principal sets the tone for curriculum change and that when active, teachers reap the benefits.

The principal does seem to play a major role during curriculum implementation. Sarson (1982) identified the principal's moral support and active participation as key elements of an effective support system during curriculum implementation. Several researchers identified another important role of the principal within the curriculum process, that of "gatekeeper" or linkage person (Dow and Whitehead, 1981; Havelock, 1973). Common (1981) believed principals must create a supportive climate, maximize teacher participation, and create a system to promote change. He reported that teachers are affected by principal support or lack of it and by principal attitude. Nicholson and Tracy (1982) found that principal involvement, clarity, and attitudes affect teacher attitude toward change. In a similar

study, Chesler, Schmuck, and Lippitt (1975) found a high correlation between school innovativeness and teacher perceptions of principal support. The Rand Study (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978) highlighted the critical role of the principal in the initiation and implementation of innovations in school districts. Innovations were most likely to be successfully implemented in schools where principals had positive attitudes toward them, expressed support for them, and actively engaged in project activities.

Research ha" also examined outcomes of citizen participation in relation to (a) efficacy, (b) improved attitudes and support, (c) increased involvement and decision quality, (d) innovation and responsiveness of the school system. In some cases the results are contradictory. Berger (1981) cited efficacy as an outcome of participation and concluded that people who participate in decision-making processes feel less powerless. Smook and Latham (1981) found that greater citizen involvement in educational decision-making resulted in more positive attitudes and perceptions toward schools. A study by Gittell, et al. (1981) where citizens participated in a district's decisions resulted in stronger community support for teachers and administration. Cloward and Jones (1963) reported that involvement of parents in school affairs was positively correlated with parent evaluation of the importance of education and attitude toward the school. Schaffarzick (1976) reported that in those cases where lay people demonstrated concern for educational changes, and worked at getting those changes accepted in the schools, the decisions tended to be more rational and the board members were more accepting of their ideas. Gittell and Hollander (1968) found that citizen participation, more than administrative organization and allocation of financial resources, had the most clear-cut cause and effect relationship with innovation. Shaffarzick's study (1976) further revealed that while establishing a philosophy and setting goals are seen as appropriate areas for community involvement in the

curriculum development process, this "early involvement" can breed cynicism when next steps are carried out by others who pay little attention to the product of citizen participation.

In general, teacher, principal and community attitudes toward participation in curriculum planning has been found to range from positive, to apathetic, to negative, yet the fact remains that these groups increasingly do participate and this participation is of great benefit to schools. Research appears to be strongest regarding the benefits of teacher participation in curriculum decision-making, but Loucks and Leiberman (1983) have pointed out "What is not clear is how much teachers ought to be engaged, nor is it clear when exactly teachers should be involved" (p. 131). Perhaps that statement sums up a concern that must include principals and community members as well. Likewise, little is known about what expectations and attitudes these three groups of potential participants bring to curriculum planning and how their initial views affect subsequent perceptions of the planning process and product. Finally, there appears also to be a need to understand the degree of participation and type of participation that will be perceived most favorably by these three groups.

SETTING OF THE STUDY

The study was carried out in one large midwest suburban district consisting of 5,000 students and 750 teachers. The district had determined that its entire curriculum in every content area should be assessed and a system developed for its revision and maintenance. The entire development project was planned to cover a three-year period. Year One focused on the analysis phase of the curriculum project. In this stage, the process and expectations for the entire project were defined, the current district

curriculum was documented, and the development activities for the second phase were planned.

Phase Two began with the second year of the curriculum project and focused on the development of new curricular components for each content area (specifically, rationales, goals, objectives and content outlines.). During this phase a curriculum system was developed for implementing, maintaining and evaluating the newly developed content area curricula on a cyclical basis.

PARTICIPANTS

At the beginning of Phase One, a Curriculum Steering Committee was formed, composed of 18 teachers who were content specialists and 16 principals. The primary tasks of the Steering Committee were to: (1) plan and organize the documentation process; (2) lead the actual documentation process; and, (3) organize the second and third phases of the curriculum development project. A Curriculum Documentation Team was formed at this time, composed of 114 teachers and 16 principals. The primary tasks of this team were to: (1) collect data on current programs in each content area; (2) define the goals and topics covered by current programs; and, (3) document these programs in written form. A Citizens' Steering Committee, composed of four community members was also formed during Phase One. Their primary objective was to develop a series of seminars and meetings to help educate community members, who intended to participate in the district development project. The Citizens' Curriculum Committee, which comprised 50 district community members, were charged with the tasks of: (1) learning about the process of curriculum development; and, (2) determining the role they wished to play in the subsequent curriculum development process in Phase Two.

During Phase Two the participants and their expected roles changed

considerably. The Curriculum Steering Committee continued to play an active planning role. Their primary tasks were to: (1) plan the tasks for each content "task force"; (2) to develop a system for reviewing and prioritizing the curriculum components developed by each content area "task force"; and, (3) plan the in-servicing required of participants in this second phase of the project. The Curriculum Documentation Team had disbanded in this phase, since its appointed task had been completed in Phase One. In its stead, sixteen content area Tas' Forces were formed, each comprising of one teacher and one principal as co-leaders, and 5-10 teachers and community members. The primary tasks of each content area task force were to: (1) develop a mutually agreeable, comprehensive rationale, and set of goals and objectives for the content area; (2) recommend possible content outlines where needed; and, (3) develop a list of prioritized tasks to be undertaken in the implementation, maintenance and evaluation of the newly developed curriculum.

The Citizens' Curriculum Steering Committee was disbanded in Phase Two, as was the Citizens' Curriculum Committee. The 54 community members involved in Phase One were assigned membership on the individual content area task forces according to their area of interest or expertise. Each task force had from two to eight of the Phase One community participants on its rolls. Figure 1 presents the 16 content area task forces established in Phase Two of the district's curriculum development project.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Figure 1 About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Figure 1

Content area task forces in phase two, arranged by general domains

I. Academic

1. Foreign Language
2. Language Arts
3. Mathematics
4. Reading
5. Science
6. Social Studies
7. Special Education

II. Cultural

8. Art
9. Musi
10. Physical Education
11. Speech & Theater

III. Vocational

12. Business/Work Study
13. Consumer Homemaking
14. Guidance
15. Health & Driver's Education
16. Industrial Education

CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

Phase One

During the first year of the district's curriculum development project, the involvement of the Curriculum Steering Committee and Curriculum Documentation Team varied a great deal. Both groups received an all-day orientation on the process of curriculum development, curricular components, and individual responsibilities of respective group membership. Then the Curriculum Steering Committee met separately to plan the documentation process, in which the Curriculum Documentation Teams would participate. Several weeks later the Steering Committee members assumed leadership of the documentation effort for one of the sixteen designated curriculum areas. A two-day release from teaching duties was subsequently provided for all Curriculum Steering Committee and Curriculum Documentation Team members while the two groups jointly proceeded to describe the goals and content topics for each "course" in the district, from "Third-grade Reading" (a year-long course) to "Architectural Drawing I" (a secondary, trimester course). Figure 2 displays the course outline format used in the documentation process with an example of one middle school course in science. During the documentation process, 470 separate "courses" were documented, resulting in 470 course outlines with a total of 1,336 pages.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Figure 2 About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The Citizens' Curriculum Committee met a total of four times over the course of the year. During the first two all-day meetings, the community members were introduced to current ideas on curriculum development, district plans for the three-year project, and the ideas of experts on the future of

Figure 2

Partial Example of Course Documentation Outline
for One Middle School Science Course

SCOPE AND SEQUENCE

CURRICULUM STUDY WORKSHEET

COURSE TITLE: Life Science

PROGRAM: Science

SUBPROGRAM/GRADE LEVEL: Grade 7

OUTLINE PREPARED BY:

OBJECTIVES OF COURSE:

The student will:

1. develop a proficiency in simple Biological Science laboratory techniques.
2. develop a proficiency in collection, organization and presentation of data.
3. express an understanding of life as it relates to its value.
4. acquire habits in critical thinking.
5. gather and provide evidence that students are learning in the classroom situations.
6. develop knowledge in terms, concepts, principles and generalizations which help the students interpret their environment.
7. develop attitudes of curiosity, and involvement with phenomena in nature.
8. develop intellectual processes of inquiry by which scientific problems are explained.
9. develop the ability to handle and manipulate materials and equipment in a productive and safe manner.

COURSE OUTLINE: Systems of measurement (one week)

GOAL: To gain a working knowledge of the various methods of international measurements and to apply these methods to everyday use.

OBJECTIVES:

The student will:

1. explain and compare the units of the metric system of measurement.
2. use the metric system to measure mass, length, and volume.
3. be able to convert metric units within the system.
4. distinguish between different scientific instruments used for making measurements.

Microbiology (10 weeks)

GOAL: To gain an understanding of the nature of cells and tissues and their role in life activities.

education. The subsequent two meetings were spent in the development of a general statement of consensus on the roles the community members wished to play in Phase Two of the project. In addition the Committee did draft a general position paper concerning their priorities for curriculum development and reform in the district.

Phase Two

During the econd year of the project, each Task Force met on its own time schedule. At the beginning of the school year, the meetings were generally held once a month, but as the spring deadline approached, many of the Task Forces met more frequently in order to complete their assigned tasks. In general, each Task Force followed the same basic procedure: (1) collect information about "ideal" goals and objectives for the content area; (2) decide which goals and objectives were feasible in the district; (3) develop a written rationale for the content area; and, (4) make and prioritize recommendations for curriculum changes (ways to eliminate any discrepancies between the district's "what is" in that content area, based on the curriculum documentation for that area, and the "what should be" as ascertained from experts and the literature).

Once each Task Force had completed its tasks, the Curriculum Steering Committee met and reviewed each Task Force "curriculum" and then made a final schedule for the implementation of each content area curriculum over the subsequent five years. The criteria by which the Steering Committee evaluated the Task Force reports included: (1) number of students impacted by the recommendations; (2) degree of complexity of the recommendations; (3) sense of urgency indicated by the recommendations; (4) sense of need indicated in the recommendations; (5) degree of response to perceived societal/community

"wants"; (6) degree of the Steering Committee member's professional judgment as to the priority of the recommendations. Each of these six criteria were ranked on a scale of 1 to 5 for each Task Force. Figures 3, 4, 5, and 6 display excerpts of the rationales, goals, immediate, and long-term recommendations identified by various task forces. The Steering Committee recommendations were published and disseminated to all district teachers and administrators with a request for feedback. This, in turn, resulted in some revision of the original Steering Committee priorities.

- -
Insert Figures 3, 4, 5, and 6 About Here
- -

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

It was felt that information acquired through a careful study of the documentation and development processes over the course of the first two phases would help the school district identify problem areas in the processes, document the actual processes as they might vary from the original expectations of the district administration, and help to evaluate the products that would result from the curriculum development project.

The intentions of this case study of the district development project, therefore, were to collect data concerning the following questions:

Phase One

1. Did the participating teachers' and administrators' initial attitudes toward curriculum development affect how they perceived the resultant curriculum documentation process and product?
2. Were the participants who reported that their expectations

Figure 3

Example of Rationale Development by Health & Driver's Education Task Force

CONTENT AREA: Health

RATIONALE: Health is a quality of life. It includes a person's physical, emotional, intellectual, social, and spiritual well-being. Health is a condition which affects every part of a person's daily living. Maintaining good health contributes to a productive and satisfying life.

Health education focuses on the uniqueness of the individual; the human issues that affect the physical, emotional, intellectual, social and spiritual growth; the development of the individual; and how the individual relates to self, family, others and their community. Achieving self-understanding, self-acceptance, and a feeling of self-worth is the basis of effective health education. Positive interaction with others is dependent on these ideals.

The ultimate purpose of health education is to view health as an integral part of life. Health educated persons will have the understanding and skills necessary to make responsible decisions in maintaining good health and to meet the demands of day-to-day life issues.

Figure 4

Example of Goals Development by Science Task Force

GOALS:

Science education in ISD 196 should strive for the development of the following:

- the use of scientific methods to investigate and solve problems.
- the psychomotor skills needed to work with scientific instruments and equipment.
- an appreciation for both the simplicity and the complexity of natural phenomena.
- the realization that scientific knowledge and theories are continuously changing.
- an appreciation of the impact of scientific advancements on our lives.
- an understanding of basic scientific knowledge, terminology and principles.
- a positive attitude that promotes the continued study of the sciences.

Figure 5

Example of Immediate Concerns Development by Language Arts Task Force

Concern Statement:

1. The curriculum documentation was useful. However, the size of the document makes it difficult to perceive gaps and overlaps. Before a K-12 curriculum can be coordinated, these gaps and overlaps need to be identified.

2. The research shows that the process method for the teaching of writing is the most successful with students.

	Problem	Solution	Who	When	Resources
1.	Gaps and laps exist in the language arts curriculum	Develop a matrix to identify the specific gaps and overlap.	Curriculum director and a committee of teachers.	As soon as possible	Models are available from other schools
2.	Since much of the research in the teaching of writing has been done in the last five years, teacher preparation in the teaching of writing is uneven.	As a start, conduct writing in-service for all elementary teachers. (Most secondary teachers have had some exposure.)	Curriculum director/a planning committee of teachers.	1985-86 school year	Many speakers are available

Figure 6

Example of Long-Range Recommendations Development by Reading Task Force

Task	Recommendations	Suggested Years
Review K-12 Curriculum		
Elementary	1. Study the effectiveness of the current basal series. 2. Study the need to purchase/develop/ organize and use supplemental reading material that is appropriate for different reading needs. 3. Study the inclusion of literature to the basic curriculum. (In addition to Ginn) 4. Study the need to include curriculum dealing with study skills in grades 4 and 5. 5. Study the need for computer reading lab to reinforce skills.	1985-87
Middle School	1. Study the need to adopt a reading program that is different from the elementary level. 2. Study the need to include a library time for student book selection for pleasure reading. 3. Study the need for a remedial reading program that is appropriate at this level. 4. Study the need for computer use in reading instruction. 5. Study the need for students to have a required reading class after sixth grade to a specified skill level. 6. Study the need for an increased emphasis on literature experiences in seventh and eighth grade.	1985-87
High School	1. Study the need for content area teachers to facilitate reading strategies in the classroom (In-service). 2. Study the need for sequencing and spiraling the challenge of literature offerings (coordinate with language arts).	1985-86
For all three levels	1. Study the need for hiring a reading coordinator immediately. 2. Study the need for teacher in-service to deal with techniques in content area.	

for participatory roles had been met more likely to have rated the participatory process favorably?

3. Was there a relationship between the amount of teacher participation in the curriculum development process and reported positive perceptions of that process?
4. Were participants who rated the participatory curriculum documentation process favorably more likely to have rated their product favorably? (Was there a relationship between process and product ratings in the participatory situation?)
5. Were the participants' perceptions of the curriculum product valid?

Phase Two

1. Did the role expectations and resultant satisfactions of the three participant groups differ significantly?
2. Did the perceptions of the development process differ among the three participant groups?
3. Did perceptions of the resultant product differ among the three groups?
4. What was the relationship between perceptions of the development process and perceptions of the product?
5. Did the process and product differ significantly according to the content area covered by that Task Force? (Were some Task Forces more successful in accomplishing their tasks?)

20

Instruments

To study these questions, a variety of instruments were used to gather the necessary information. Table 1 presents the names of these instruments

and the study questions for which they were used to collect data.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The Teacher/Administrator Self-Analysis Inventory (TSAI) was developed by Beauchamp (1970) to describe and measure teacher behaviors and attitudes toward curriculum plans and planning. The inventory consists of 51 statements to which the respondent indicates each statement accurate, inaccurate, more accurate than inaccurate, or more inaccurate than accurate. The items measure respondents' perceptions of how their curriculum is used, whether or not the curriculum is self-sufficient, and what relationship exists between curriculum and textbook. In previous use of this instrument, the Cronbach Alpha Reliability Coefficient was .85, which was consistent with earlier findings of Beauchamp (Kimpston, 1980).

The Process and Product Scales were developed by Hall (1976). Utilizing a seven-point Likert scale, the Process Scale allows the respondent to judge specific characteristics generically inherent in curriculum development processes. The major components of process and the characteristics measured for each component may also be found in Figure 7.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Figure 7 About Here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

21

Likewise, using a seven-point Likert, Hall's Product Scale allows the respondent to judge specific characteristics inherent in the outcomes of a curriculum development process, i.e., the product. The major components of a

Table 1

Instruments Used in this Study

Name of Instrument	Data Collected to Answer Phase I Questions	Data Colllected to Answer Phase II Questions
1. Self-Analysis Inventory (Beauchamp) Teacher Version Administrator Version	1	1, 5
2. Expectations/Satisfactions Questionnaire (Kimpston and Rogers)	2	- - -
3. Curriculum Documentation Process Scale (Hall)	1, 2, 3, 4	2, 4, 5
4. Curriculum Documentation Product Scale (Hall)	4, 5	3, 4, 5
5. Product Checklist (Kimpston and Rogers)	5	- - -

Figure 7

Components of Hall's "Process" and "Product" scales

PROCESS SCALE

1. PROCESS GOALS AND TASKS
   - Scale 1: Clarity
   - Scale 2: Agreement
   - Scale 3: Source

2. PROCESS PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATION PATTERNS
   - Scale 4: Equality
   - Scale 5: Consideration
   - Scale 6: Openness
   - Scale 7: Group vs. Individual Direction
   - Scale 8: Relevance

3. PROCESS LEADERSHIP
   - Scale 9: Formality
   - Scale 10: Democratism
   - Scale 11: Skillfulness
   - Scale 12: Sensitivity
   - Scale 13: Authority

4. PROCESS STRUCTURE AND ATMOSPHERE
   - Scale 14: Regularity
   - Scale 15: Stability
   - Scale 16: Orientation
   - Scale 17: Solidarity
   - Scale 18: Tone
   - Scale 19: Flexibility

5. PROCESS RESULTS
   - Scale 20: Closure
   - Scale 21: Satisfaction
   - Scale 22: Implementation

PRODUCT SCALE

1. PRODUCT GOALS
   - Scale 1: Direction
   - Scale 2: Explicitness
   - Scale 3: Congruence
   - Scale 4: Effectiveness

2. PRODUCT DOCUMENTS
   - Scale 5: Comprehensiveness
   - Scale 6: Significance
   - Scale 7: Substantiveness

3. PRODUCT DECISIONS AND IDEAS
   - Scale 8: Relevance
   - Scale 9: Feasibility
   - Scale 10: Appropriateness
   - Scale 11: Creativity

curriculum product and the characteristics measured for each component may also be found in Table 5. Validation of these two instruments was secured from the authoritative opinions of curriculum and evaluation experts. No attempt was made by Dr. Hall to rigorously quantify the results obtained from use of the two scales; rather, they were used as an aid in describing and qualitatively evaluating the "process" aspect of each committee and the "product" or output phase of curriculum planning.

The Expecta'ions/Satisfactions Questionnaire (ESQ) was developed specifically for this study project (Kimpston & Rogers, 1984). In addition to demographic information about each study participant, the questionnaire measures each participant's (1) expectations for participation, (2) satisfactions in actual participation, and, (3) general impressions (including dissatisfactions with the process).

Finally, the Product Checklist was also developed (Kimpston & Rogers, 1984) to evaluate both the nature of the documentation product and its purpose (Phase One only). A four-point Likert scale was designed to measure 15 specific characteristics of each course outline produced in the documentation process and to additionally measure seven general purposes by which the outlines might be judged. For Phase Two, an informal evaluation of each Task Force report along with Steering Committee mean ratings was conducted.

Procedure

Phase One. The TSAI was administered during the full-day orientation session to all members of the Curriculum Steering Committee and the Curriculum Documentation Team. A 99% response rate was received. At a planning meeting of the Curriculum Steering Committee four months later, after the documentation products had been completed, the Process Scale, Product Scale, and the ESQ were administered with a 100% response rate. These same

instruments were administered through school mail to the Documentation Team members who were not on the Steering Committee. An 86% response rate was achieved through this procedure. The curriculum documentation products were independently rated by the two authors using the Product Checklist. An inter-rater reliability coefficient of .92 was achieved. No instruments were administered to the community groups during the first phase of this process because their tasks were not aligned with those of the teachers and administrators.

Phase Two. The Process Scale, Product Scale, and the ESQ were administered through the mail upon completion of all Phase Two activities, with a 77% response rate. The products of each task force and the final recommendations of the Curriculum Steering Committee were informally reviewed and evaluated by the authors.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Phase One

First, ANOVAs were run on: (1) differences between teachers and administrators in their responses on the TSAI, ESQ, and the Process and Product scale ratings; and, (2) differences between Steering Committee responses and Documentation Team responses on these same instruments. Secondly, correlations were computed among item responses on these same four instruments.

For the first question concerning the influence of initial attitudes upon the perceptions of the newly developed process and product, the answer was negative. Although teachers and administrators differed significantly in their initial attitudes toward the district curriculum, no significant difference was found between the two groups in their perceptions of the final

product. In terms of process, however, the participating teachers reported a higher degree of satisfaction. It was noted, however, that both groups generally possessed favorable initial attitudes toward curriculum planning and, likewise, rated the participatory process and its product favorably.

The second question of concern in Phase One dealt with measuring the relationship between expected participatory roles and reported satisfactions with these roles after participation had occurred. Documentation Team members were found to ha·e had significantly more positive correlations among their expectations of and satisfactions with the process and product in which they participated, than did the Steering Committee members.

Question three in Phase One was directed toward measuring the relationship between the degree of participation and the degree to which perceptions of that participatory process were favorable. The results showed significantly more negative perceptions among those participants who were the most deeply involved in the process.

The focus of question four was to measure the relationship between satisfactory participation in the curriculum planning process and the degree to which the product was favorably perceived. Consistently positive, significant correlations were found among several components of the process and product for participants of the Documentation Team, but similar relationships were not found for the Steering Committee. In actuality, the tasks of the Documentation Team and the Steering Committee did not reflect the same degree of responsibility, decision-making, and depth of participation with the process or the product. However, those participants who served in a dual role, i.e., were members of both the Documentation Team and the Steering Committee, did rate most aspects of the process and product more favorably than either group of single-role participants.

The last question posed in Phase One was concerned with the validity of

participants' perceptions of the curriculum product. As the results indicated, those perceptions appeared to be quite valid, with 94% of the curriculum documents receiving an "acceptable" to "excellent" rating when subjected to the "expert evaluation" procedure.

Phase Two

In this phase, ANOVAs were calculated based on responses to the ESQ and the Process and Product Scales to measure (1) the differences among teachers, administrators, and community participants; (2) differences between teachers and administrators who had been participating in the project during both phases; and, (3) differences in perceptions among individual task force participation. Secondly, correlations were computed among item responses on these same three instruments.

In response to the first question concerning differences among the three participant groups in their role expectations and resultant satisfactions, the answer was positive. A very different pattern of expectations and resultant satisfactions was found for each of the three groups of participants. The administrators rated the degree of closure to the development process much higher than did the other two groups of participants (p. .05). For this group, the expectation of having a voice in determining the curriculum to be taught was the major reason for becoming involved in the project. Once the project was completed, this expectation showed significant correlations with the administrators' satisfactions in being exposed to different points of view and acquiring new ideas and information. Two other expectations were also cited as primary reasons for these administrators' involvement: discovering how curriculum planning occurs and increasing personal prestige as a result of participating as a committee member. These expectations were reportedly met, as measured by the high correlation with the parallel satisfactions on the

ESQ.

A second major difference among the three groups of participants was discovered in the community members's desire to become knowledgeable about the district's curriculum development process. As a primary reason for becoming involved in the curriculum development process, this expectation was rated significantly higher for the community group. The parallel satisfaction for their initial expectation did not correlate very positively, however. For them, the major atisfaction with the process was being able to use their background, skills, and interests as a committee member. For teachers who participated in the project, the expectation that they might increase their prestige in the district showed a significant, positive correlation with increased self-esteem as a satisfaction with participation. In only one respect did all three participant groups report a similar, strong expectation for participation in the develpment project: all three groups expected to increase their prestige as a result of participating as a committee member!

The second question of concern in Phase Two dealt with possible differences in perceptions of the development process among the three participant groups. Although the perceptions of process across all five components (see Figure 7) were generally positive, a pattern appeared to result in which teachers and community members perceived the process a certain way and administrators perceived the process even more so. Significant differences of perception were found. The participating administrators perceived the goals and tasks of the process as more clearly defined and as tending to emanate directly from District Office directives, unlike the teacher or community groups. Likewise, it was the administrators who found the process of participation and the communication patterns as more open, equal, group-oriented, relevant, and more considerate of all differences of opinion within the group. Administrators also differed signficantly from

teachers and community member participants in their perceptions of leadership in the process. They viewed the democratism, skillfulness, sensitivity to individual needs, and authority of Task Force leaders more highly. Again, in perceptions of process structure and atmosphere, the administrators rated the regularity and stability of attendance, the task-orientation of the group, its solidarity, friendliness of tone, and flexibility higher than did other project participants. Likewise, administrators perceived a significantly higher degree of closure to and satisfaction with the results of the process in which they participated. They were more confident that the results, i.e., the Task Force recommendations, would be implemented by the District Office.

Among the three groups, three individual patterns of perceptions did seem to emerge as ratings of the individual characteristics of each of the five process components on the Process Scale were examined. For administrators the most successful characteristics of the process were solidarity of their Task Force group and the sensitivity of the Task Force leader to individual needs within the group. Equality of participation, the relevance of each Task Force member's viewpoint, and the flexibility of the group were the least important/successful characteristics of the process in which they had engaged. Teacher participants ranked agreement within each group to the tasks and goals prescribed for the process, the sensitivity of the Task Force leader, and the solidarity of their Task Force group as the most successful charcteristics, while the flexibility of the group, the task-orientation of their respective Task Forces, and the authoritative stance of the Task Force leader were the least successful characteristics. For community members, the openness of communication among Task Force members, the agreement of the members to the tasks and goals prescribed for the process, and the consideration of Task Force members for differences of opinion were perceived as the most successful characteristics of the process. The formality of the Task Force leaders, the

regularity of meetings and attendance, and the flexibility of the group were rated least important or successful.

Perception differences of the curriculum development product were also found among the three groups (Question Three). Administrators rated the direction, explicitness, congruence of the product to original intentions, and the effectiveness of the product significantly more positively than did other participants in the project. No other differences in perceptions of the product along the three dimensions of the Product Scale were found.

In analyzing the individual characteristics of each product component, however, very different patterns of product perception were found for the three groups. Administrators rated the direction of the product, its effectiveness, and its comprehensiveness most highly, and noted less success in the general significance and substantiveness of their development product (i.e., curriculum recommendations for change). Teachers, on the other hand, felt the direction and the comprehensiveness of the product were the least successful of its characteristics, and found the appropriateness and creativity of their Task Force recommendations to be the most successful elements of product. Community members agreed with teachers on the appropriateness and creativity of the Task Force recommendations, but also rated the effectiveness, significance, and practicality of these recommendations very high. Less successfully perceived were the direction and explicitness of the product.

As with Phase One, the focus of Question Four was to measure the relationship between satisfactory participation in the curriculum planning process and the degree to which the resultant product was favorably perceived. Again, the patterns of significant correlation between the various dimensions of process and product as measured on the Hall Process and Product scales, differed among the three participant groups. Table 2 presents these results.

Table 2

Degree of correlation among process and product components of Hall's instruments

	Process Goals & Tasks	Process Particip. & Commun. Patterns	Process Leadership	Process Structure & Atmosphere	Process Results
Product Goals	Very High **	High * Pc 5 + Pd 4	High * Pc 9 + Pd 4	High * Pc 16 + Pc 19	Very High ** Pc 22 +
Product Documents	Very High **	High * Pc 5 +	High * Pc 9 + Pc 11 + Pd 7 +	High * Pc 16 +	Very High **
Product Discussion & Ideas	Very High **	Very High ** Pc 5 +	High * Pc 9 + Pc 13 + Pc 8 +	Very High ** Pc 16 +	Very High **

+ The processes (Pc) and products (Pd) enumerated were exceptions to the correlative pattern described in the cell. Nonsignificant correlations were found for at least 80%

Pc 5 = Consideration of opinions, Pd 4 = Goal effectiveness
Pc 9 = Formality of leadership, Pd 7 = Document substantiveness
Pc 11 = Skillfulness of leadership, Pd 8 = Relevance of major decisions
Pc 13 = Leader-centered authority
Pc 16 = Process vs. task-orientation
Pc 22 = Likelihood of product implementation

* At least 80% of the correlations among process and product characteristics in the category were significant at the $p < .05$ level.

** At least 80% of the correlations among process and product characteristics in the category were significant at the $P < .001$ level.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -
Insert Table 2 About Here
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Concerning the final research question for Phase Two, whether there would be differences among the various task forces in degrees of satisfaction with the participative process and resultant product, some differences were noted. The sixteen task forces were first categorized as either (1) academic (combining the task forces of foreign language, language arts, mathematics, reading, science, social studies, and special education); (2) cultural (combining the task forces of art, music, physical education, speech & theater); and, (3) vocational (combining the task forces of business education, consumer homemaking, guidance, health & drivers' education, and industrial education). ANOVAs run on differences of perceptions among these three "force" groups revealed no significant findings in initial expectations, resultant satisfactions, and impressions of the participative process. One significant difference among the three force groups was found in their perceptions of process on the Process scale. The Vocational task forces tended to perceive the regularity and stability of attendance at meetings, the solidarity of group meetings and the flexibility of the process as significantly more successful characteristics of the process than did the Academic and Cultural Task Force groups. No differences in general perceptions of product on the Product scale were found among the three Task Force groupings.

DISCUSSION

The results of this two-year case study, revealed several insights about project participants and provided at least partial answers to the questions initially posed for each phase of the study.

As was pointed out previously, although teachers and administrators differed significantly in their attitudes toward the district curriculum, no significant difference was found between the two groups in their perception of the curriculum documentation product (Phase One). In perceptions of the documentation process, however, the teachers were more satisfied than were administrators. This latter difference did not persist in Phase Two where it was found that administrators rated all five components of the curriculum development process higher than did teachers or community members. Part of this difference may be explained by the leadership roles every administrator assumed in Phase Two of the project. Each was a co-leader of one Task Force. Thus, this difference in role from the majority of teacher and community members in the project may have tended to bias the administrator's views of the process. Only sixteen of the teachers involved held leadership positions. Further research is warranted to test the hypothesis that a greater degree of decision-making (and ownership) when given to participants tends to result in a more favorable perception of the process in which they participate. In relating back to the review of research on principals as curriculum leaders, this case study would tend to confirm that direct participation by principals/administrators results in subsequent support for the decisions rendered by the participative process.

As this study attempted to measure the relationship between expected participatory roles and reported satisfactions with these roles after participation, differences in this relationship were found depending upon the

actual roles participants did assume and the extent to which they were involved in the process. In Phase One, those participants, i.e., the Documentation Team members, who had less of a planning and decision-making role tended to rate their satisfactions with the process and product more positively. A possible explanation for this result may lie in an event that occurred to the Steering Committee on the day the final research instruments were administered. The group had just been told that their role was being changed such tha' they would be responsible for prioritizing the recommendations of the Task Forces in the second phase of the project and that they would have six months less in which to complete the work of Phase Two. It is possible that the negative correlations that resulted reflect this sudden change in their expected roles and contributed to their lack of satisfaction with the process in which they were presently involved. In Phase Two, these Steering Committee members became Task Force leaders in most cases, and their perceptions of and satisfactions with the process were significanly more positive than task force members with less of a planning and decision-making role. In actuality, the greater degree of participation for members in both phases resulted in higher degrees of satisfaction with the processes and products. In Phase One, those participants who served as both Steering Committee and Documentation Team members rated the process and product highest. This would suggest that the findings of this study generally supported the conclusions of earlier research efforts. The relationship between participation and positive perceptions of process and product is strong and positive.

Phase Two of this study provided some interesting insights into the workings of a truly participative curriculum development project, one in which community members were given substantive curriculum development tasks. It was interesting to note the commonality of perceptions between teachers and

community members about the process in which they were jointly engaged. Quite unexpected was the result that the administrators would differ from the other two groups so greatly in their perceptions of process and product. Further studies need to be carried out to determine the effect the feeling of "power" may have played in the resultant pattern of differences measured in this study. A heartening result was the high degree of cooperation and equality of group participation reported by teachers and community members as they worked together on this project. It is apparent that teachers and community can work as "equals" in curriculum development when the goals and tasks of that process are clearly defined and supported by district administration.

One strength and unexpected contribution of this case study was the depth of description about curriculum planning processes and product which the five instruments were able to provide. Correlations were high among items on the various instruments concerned with the same aspects of the curriculum process or product (e.g., goals, leadership, atmosphere, feasibility of results, etc.). Thus, the significant relationships measured between participation and perceptions of process and product were doubly validated. The method used to observe this planning process and its subsequent product may prove to be a viable one for a variety of curriculum planning processes, even beyond the processes of analysis and development undertaken in this project.

Despite the numerous strengths and interesting findings in this case study, its limitations must also be mentioned. First and foremost, it is important to keep in mind the difficulty of generalizing case study data, even with the amount of data collected and the size of the study sample. Second, there is always the potential for inaccuracy when collecting data based on self-report. It was felt, however, that the close contact and frequent discussions with district personnel helped to verify the accuracy of trends measured by the multiple instruments used and the correlations found among

those instruments.

The results of this study confirmed a belief that the participants in this system-wide curriculum development project spanning two years brought to that process certain attitudes and beliefs that influenced their views of that process and the resulting product. It is hoped that these findings will be validated as the implementation phase of the project is initiated and studied.

REFERENCES

Alutto, J., & Belasco, J. (1972, Winter). Decisional participation and teacher satisfaction. Educational Administration Quarterly, 8 (1), 44-58.

Berger, J. (1981). Communal societal participation: An investigation of an innovative definition of citizen participation in regard to powerlessness and normlessness. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal program supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.

Carson, R., & Friesen, J. (1978). Teacher participation: A second look. Washington, DC: University Press of America, Inc.

Chesler, M., Schmuck, R., & Lippitt, R. (1975). The principal's role in facilitating innovation. In J. V. Baldridge & T. Deal (Eds.), Managing change in educational organizations (pp. 321-327). Berkeley: McCutchan.

Common, D. L. (1981). Two decades of curriculum innovation and so little change. Education Canada, ,42-47.

Cloward, R., & Jones, J. (1963). Social class: Educational attitudes and participation. In A. H. Passow (Ed.), Education in depressed areas, New York: Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

Dow, I., & Whitehead, R. (1981). New perspectives on curriculum implementation: A survey of teacher, principal, and consultant/ coordinator concerns. Ontario: Ontario Public School, Men Teachers' Federation.

Duke, D., Showers, B., & Imbel, M. (1980, Winter). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. Educational Administration Quarterly, 16 (1), 93-106.

Eastabrook, G., & Fullan, M. (1978). School and community: Principals and community schools in Ontario. Toronto: Ministry of Education, OISE Press.

Fullan, M. (1981). School district and school personnel in knowledge utilization. In R. Loehming & M. Kane (Eds.), Improving schools: Using what we know. Beverly Hills: Sage Publishing Company.

Fullan, M., & Pomfret, A. (1977, Winter). Research in curriculum and instruction implementation. Review of Educational Research, 47 (1), 335-397.

Garms, W., Guthrie, J., & Pierce, L. (1978). School finance. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gittell, M., Berube, M., Gottfried, F. Buttentag, M., & Spier, A. (1971). Democracy for social change: An experiment in local control. New York: Queens College of the City University of New York. Institute for Community Studies.

Gittell, M., & Hollander, T. E. (1968). Six urban school districts: A comparative study of instructional response. New York: F. A. Praeger.

Hall, M. (1976). An evaluation of curriculum planning processes and products. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL.

Havelock, R. (1973). The change agent's guide to innovation in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Hord, S., & Austin, L. (1984, March). Why isn't it working at the classroom level? Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hoy, W., & Miskel, C. (1978). Educational administration: Theory, research, and practice. New York: Random House.

Johnson, D., & Johnson, F. (1975). Joining together. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kimpston, R. (1980, March). Effects of the locus of curriculum decision-making on teacher attitudes and behaviors. Paper presented to the annual meeting, American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Kimpston, R., & Rogers, K. (1984). Expectations/satisfactions questionnaire. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Kimpston, R., & Rogers, K. (1984). Product checklist. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Likert, R. (1967). The human organization. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lippitt, R., & Colleagues (1967). The teacher as innovator, seeker, and sharer of new practices. In R. Miller (Ed.), Perspectives on educational change, (pp. 307-324). NY: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lortie, D. (1975). School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loucks, S., & Leiberman, A. (1983). Curriculum implementation. In F. English (Ed.), Fundamental curriculum decisions. pp. 126-141. Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Mohrman, A. Jr., Cooke, R., & Mohrman, S. (1978, Winter). Participation in decision making: A multidimensional perspective. Educational Administration Quarterly, 14 (1), 13-29.

Myers, M. S. (1970). Every employee a manager. New York: McGraw-Hill

Nicholson, E., & Tracy, S. (1982, Fall). Principal's influence on teacher's attitude and implementation of curricular change. Education, 103 (1), 68-73.

Ponder, A., & Bulcock, J. (1976, March). Friction point rating: A blueprint for selective decentralization in school systems. The Canadian Administrator, 15 (6), 1-6.

Sarason, S. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Schaffarzick, J. (1976). Teacher and lay participation in local curriculum change considerations. Paper presented at annual meeting, American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Smook, M., & Latham, P. (1981). A summary of an investigation of the impact of advisory committees. Columbia, SC: South Carolina State Department of Education.

Young, J. (1979, March). The curriculum decision-making preferences of school personnel. The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 25 (1), 20-29.